



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/473,554	12/29/1999	KENNETH MCCLAMROCH	RSW9-99-119	1113

7590 03/20/2003

MARK D SIMPSON
SYNNESTVEDT & LECHNER LLP
2600 ARAMARK TOWER
1101 MARKET STREET
PHILADELPHIA, PA 191072950

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, CINDY

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2171

DATE MAILED: 03/20/2003

11

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/473,554	MCCLAMROCH ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Cindy Nguyen	2171	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 February 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 29 December 1999 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on 16 August 2002 is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ . |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4 . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

This is in response to request for reconsideration filed 02/10/03.

1. Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rose et al (U.S.5,752,244) in view of Bowman-Anuah (U.S 6256773) (Bowman).

Regarding claims 1 and 7, Rose disclose: A computer-implemented method for indexing and locating assets stored on a storage device (86, fig. 4 and corresponding text, Rose), comprising the steps of:

performing a crawl process (46, fig. 4 and corresponding text, Rose) on said storage device to identify stored assets (col. 21, lines 60-61, Rose);
identifying asset-specific parameters related to said stored assets (col. 22, lines 18-21, Rose);

analyzing said stored assets based on said identified asset-specific parameters (col. 22, lines 24-28, Rose);

storing and indexing said extracted textual and semantic information for retrieval parameters (col. 22, lines 17-21, Rose);

extracting textual (col. 22, lines 40-44, Rose). However, Rose didn't disclose: semantic information from said stored assets. On the other hand, Bowman disclose: semantic information from said stored assets (col. 4, lines 22-29, Bowman). Thus, at the time invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include semantic information in the system as taught by Bowman, in the system of Rose. The motivation being to enable the user to retrieve the data in multimedia assets faster.

Regarding claim 2, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 1. In addition, Rose/Bowman discloses: wherein said stored assets comprise assets of diverse types (col. 23, lines 26-32, Rose), and wherein said identifying step identifies the asset type of each stored asset (col. 23, lines 36-39, Rose).

Regarding claim 3, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 2. In addition, Rose/Bowman discloses: wherein said extracting step includes the extraction of semantic information specific to the asset type of each stored asset" (col. 1, lines 65 to col. 2, lines 5, Rose).

Regarding claims 4 and 15, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 3 and 11, respectively. In addition, Rose/Bowman discloses: wherein said stored assets comprise code assets and wherein said asset-specific parameters comprise languages in which each code asset is written (see col. 25, lines 34-47, Rose);

Regarding claims 5 and 16, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 4 and 15, respectively. In addition, Rose/Bowman discloses: wherein said analysis step is performed using language-specific analyzers corresponding to the languages of said code assets (col. 15, lines 8-23, Rose).

Regarding claims 6 and 17, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 5 and 16, respectively. In addition, Rose/Bowman discloses: wherein said language-specific analyzers analyze said stored assets based on predetermined parameters specific to the language to which they correspond (col. 15, lines 46-56, Rose).

Regarding claim 8, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 7. In addition, Rose/Bowman discloses: locating means for locating stored assets by applying a search query to said semantic information stored in said storing and indexing means” (col. 15, lines 24-29, Rose).

Regarding claim 9, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 8. In addition, Rose/Bowman discloses: wherein said locating means includes means for applying a search query to said textual information stored in said storing and indexing means” (col. 14, lines 43-52, Rose).

Regarding claim 10, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 9. In addition, Rose/Bowman discloses: wherein said locating means includes means for applying a search query to both said semantic information and said textual information simultaneously (col. 28, lines 5-16, Bowman). Thus, at the time invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include a search query to both semantic information and textual information simultaneously in the system as taught by Bowman, in the system of Rose. The motivation being to enable the user to retrieve the data in multimedia assets faster.

Regarding claim 11, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claims 2 and 7. In addition, Rose/Bowman discloses: wherein said analyzing means comprises an analysis server (10, fig. 1 and corresponding text, Rose) connected between said crawling

means (col. 14, lines 5-12, Rose), and said storing (col. 14, lines 33-35, Rose) and indexing means (col. 14, lines 61-64, Rose) said analysis server including one or more asset-type specific servers (the library 23 in fig. 1, Rose), with at least one of said asset types having a corresponding asset-type specific analyzer (col. 14, lines 19-25, Rose).

Regarding claim 12, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 11. In addition, Rose/Bowman discloses: wherein a plurality of said asset types have a corresponding asset-type specific analyzer (col. 6, lines 4-18, Rose).

Regarding claim 13, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 12. In addition, Rose/Bowman discloses: wherein each of said asset types has a corresponding asset-type specific analyzer (col. 20, lines 9-15, Rose).

Regarding claim 14, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 11. In addition, Rose/Bowman discloses: wherein said asset-type specific analyzer extracts predefined semantic information specific to the asset type to which it corresponds (col. 6, lines 61-65, Rose).

3. Response to Applicant's Arguments (filed 02/10/03)

At page 5, Applicant argues: Rose doesn't disclose: performance of a crawl process. In response, Rose clearly discloses performance of a crawl process as a web browser 46 at fig. 4, and the definition of a crawl is a web browser in Microsoft Computer Dictionary, fifth Edition.

Applicant argues: Rose doesn't disclose: identification of asset-specific parameters related to stored assets. In response, Rose discloses identification of asset-specific parameters related to stored assets at col. 5, lines 18-31.

Applicant argues: Rose doesn't disclose: the storing and indexing of extracted textual and semantic information for retrieval parameter. In response, Rose discloses the storing and indexing of extracted textual and semantic information for retrieval parameters at col. 5, lines 31-59.

Applicant argues: Rose doesn't disclose: analyzing said stored assets based on said identified asset-specific parameters. In response, Rose discloses analyzing said stored assets based on said identified asset-specific parameters at col. 7, lines 40-64.

Applicant argues: Bowman doesn't disclose or suggest the extraction of semantic information from stored assets. In response, Bowman discloses the extraction of semantic information from stored assets at col. 49, lines 48-67.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 2171

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

4. Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cindy Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-305-4698. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 8:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 703-308-1436. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular communications and 703-746-7240 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

CN

Cindy Nguyen
March 10, 2003



SAFET METJAHIC
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100